



A novel risk assessment method using dynamic simulation of fire and egress scenarios on off-shore platforms

Markert, Frank; Duijm, Nijs Jan; Kozine, Igor

Publication date:
2014

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

Citation (APA):

Markert, F. (Author), Duijm, N. J. (Author), & Kozine, I. (Author). (2014). A novel risk assessment method using dynamic simulation of fire and egress scenarios on off-shore platforms. Sound/Visual production (digital)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal


If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

A novel risk assessment method using dynamic simulation of fire and egress scenarios on off-shore platforms

Frank Markert, Nijs Jan Duijm, Igor Kozine

Technical University of Denmark
Risk Research Group

fram@DTU.Dk




Introduction

- Oil & Gas production is a cornerstone of our society
- The production requires high safety standards
- Risk Assessment & Management is needed to establish and maintain safety standards

New approach feasibility study:

- OPHRA – Offshore Platform Hydrocarbon Risk Assessment
- Alternative QRA method using dynamic modelling



Why is an alternative QRA method useful?

Simplifying the logic

- Present RA apply conventional fault-tree FT and event-tree ET techniques
 - FT and ET easily grow very complex when capturing all possible accident scenarios
- The accident scenarios, e.g. loss-of-containment events, involve several agents and actions, with mutual dependencies
 - Are treated as “independent” and each may have its own timeline, e.g.:
 - Release – dispersion – ignition – fire and explosion
 - Detection - Alarm – escape from module – mustering – evacuation
 - Detection – shutdown and blowdown


Verifying risk analysis outcomes

Risk analysis' objective is to predict the future

- The outcome cannot directly be validated
- But the assumptions can be reviewed (best knowledge and experience?)


Knowledge and assumptions needed in QRA:

- Structure /operational data
 - Physical layout (simplifications to be made?)
 - Working practices, manning (up to date?)
- Modelling physical phenomena
 - Are models validated? (state-of-the-art? Within scope?)
 - Can models be applied (simplifications to be made)?
- Causal descriptions
 - Are scenarios applicable and consistent?
 - Are scenarios complete (all hazards covered)?
- Probabilistic information from statistics
 - Are statistics valid for the case?




Why is an alternative QRA method useful?

Application of dynamic & dependent models



- The event sequences trigger each other and are simulated concurrently.
- Events taking place in one sequence change the conditions in the other sequences (dynamic interaction)

Interdependencies established




Discrete event simulation

- Event sequences are simulated in parallel.
- Dynamic interaction of events
 - Events taking place in one sequence change the conditions in the other sequences
- Data are sampled statistically,
 - e.g. hole size, wind speed, number and position workers
 - Multiple runs (many!) are performed to extract risk numbers (IR, PLL, group risk)
- Individual scenarios can be simulated graphically (animation)




DES model logic

1) input parameters, 2) Consequences, 3) Evacuation



Rockwell 's Arena software

The off-shore platform




DES model validation

- Domain experts can participate actively in validation, as the models are simple to understand and a change in input can be immediately seen in output.
- Animation of scenarios facilitates significantly validation
- The models and data for each block can be verified or validated separately.
- DES models provide better transparency on applied models, assumptions made and output
- Models of the 4 sequences are validated using controlled input both for single runs and for batch simulations.


Data & Models

- At present a simple set of models included:
 - LoC frequencies: OGP data
 - Dispersion and ignition: (based on) EI/IP/UKOOA correlations
 - Jet fire: Chamberlain model (Yellow Book)
 - First approach to effect and egress models




Mass rate 0.15 kg/s d= 4.7mm; 15 kg/s d=47 mm; 300 kg/s d= 200 mm; P= 50 bar


Dispersion-in-module model




1 - Physical phenomena




2 – Detection and response



3 – Escape and evacuation



4 – Impact and consequence



Example results:

10000 simulation runs				
Input:	average	st.dev.	min	max
wind speed (m/s)	11	5	5	20
wind direction (degrees)	91	52	0	180
hole size statistic (mm)	12	28	1	200
No. workers at random positions	4		3	5
Output:				
wind speed in module (m/s)	0.6	0.3	0.1	1.4
mass flow (kg/s)	6.2	27.8	0.007	271.5
SEPmax jet flame (kW/s)	40	11	28	93
RSET (s)	240		176	301
ASET (s)	427		0	>600
No. fatalities per accident	1.3	1.8	0	5

Approach of our choice: **Discrete Event Simulation**

1. Models processes and events
2. Models are dynamic (vs. static conventional models)
3. Data are sampled statistically, e.g. hole size, wind speed
4. Easy housekeeping of models and results
 - transparency of calculations
5. Animation and graphical scenarios contribute to understanding and confidence
6. Domain experts understand models and influence their development
7. Easy integration of the technical part and human performance
8. Multiple runs are performed to extract risk numbers for assessing Individual Risk, Potential Loss of Life, Group Risk)

Concluding remarks

- Discrete Event Simulation modelling has proven viability for the risk analysis of different safety critical systems.
- It works and can produces a great deal of informative output and, in particular, probabilistic risk measures.
- The approach is highly applicable in other areas e.g. fire safety management

Thank you for your interest

fram@dtu.dk